

Examination of precautioning clauses in Seediq^{1,2}

TSUKIDA Naomi

1. Introduction to precautioning clauses

In general, precautioning clauses are studied in the context of clause linking. Dixon (2009) subsumed these clauses under “possible consequences”. In expressing precautionary situations, the supporting clause, or the precautioning clause in this case, expresses a highly probable and undesirable situation, whereas the main clause expresses what should be (or what was) done to prevent the situation. Some languages have dedicated markers for precautioning clauses. The word *lest* is an example of such a marker in English. Some languages do not have a dedicated marker; instead, they use compositional strategies.

The following questions have attracted scholarly attention (Vuillermet and Schulze-Berndt 2018):

- A. Form and function. Does a language have a dedicated marker for precautioning clauses? If not, how are such clauses expressed, and how does the pragmatic link with undesirability arise synchronically from this expression?
- B. Historical development. How did the pragmatic link historically arise from the expression? Is the proposal by Lichtenberk (1995: 319) regarding development (precautioning > fear > apprehensional-epistemics) plausible in all languages with such functions?
- C. Clause order. Does the preemptive clause always precede the precautionary clause (Dixon 2009: 48)?
- D. Argument-configuration. Some studies (Dench 1988, Schmidtke-Bode 2009) indicate that the subjects of supporting and focal clauses tend to differ. Does this tendency hold for the language in question?
- E. Semantics. Lichtenberk (1995) subdivided precautioning functions into avertive and in-case functions. Although *lest* can mark both

avertive and in-case functions, the avertive can be paraphrased using “*so that* ... NEGATIVE,” whereas this cannot be done for in-case functions, as shown in Examples (1a) and (1b).

- (1) a. Take your umbrella lest you be wet/so that you won't get wet.
(Avertive)
b. Take your umbrella lest it rain/??? so that it won't rain. (In-case)
The current analysis of Seediq considers the aforementioned points.

2. Introduction to the Seediq language

Seediq is an Austronesian language spoken in northeastern Taiwan and belongs to the Atayalic subgroup. It comprises three dialects: Teruku, Tekedaya, and Te'uda. This study uses Teruku data collected by the author. The study by Tsukida (2005) provides in-depth information on Seediq.

The population of Seediq people was approximately 40,000 in 2016; this number included approximately 30,000 individuals from the Teruku Tribe and 10,000 from the Seediq tribe. The Teruku tribe speaks the Teruku dialect, whereas the Seediq tribe speaks either the Tekedaya or Te'uda dialect. Teruku and Seediq youth do not speak this language, which has caused it to become endangered.

The basic word order of the Seediq clause is predicate initial and subject final, as shown in Example (2).

- (2) Me-narux ka baki³.
AV-be_sick NOM old_man⁴
'The old man is sick.'

Menarux “be sick,” which is the predicate, comes first, and *ka baki* “the old man,” which is the subject, occurs at the end of the clause.

Adnominal modifiers follow the head noun, except in quantity expressions, as shown in Example (3).

- (3) Teru huling paru gaga.
three dog big that
'those three big dogs'

Teru “three,” which is a quantity expression, comes first. It is followed

by *huling* “dog,” which is the head noun; *paru* “big,” which is a modifier; and *gaga* “that,” which is a demonstrative. Demonstratives appear in the last position.

This language has several prepositions but no postpositions. In Example (4), *bitaq* is a preposition.

- (4) Talang bitaq rehengun ka laqi.
 <AV>run up_to gate NOM child
 ‘The child runs to the gate.’

This language has a symmetrical voice system of the Philippine type (Himmelman 2005).

3. Precautioning clauses in Seediq

Seediq uses a compositional strategy to express precautioning. The precautioning expression in Seediq is the “*saw* + ‘*adi* + FUTURE ... ” construction (FUTURE refers to the future form of a predicate). *Saw* is the simulative marker. This expression may precede or follow the preemptive clause. In Examples (5) and (6), the precautioning clause follows the preemptive clause.

- (5) Nduwa-i ka kari=su saw ‘adi
 make_proper-GV.NFIN NOM word=2SG.GEN SIMIL NEG
 te~tiyu-un.
 FUT~blame-GV.FUT

‘Make your words proper lest one should be blamed.’

(Patas Suyang Kari Truku)

- (6) Kesug-a=ta saw ‘adi mpe-kesa: <<‘Ini=su
 fear-AV.HORT=1PL.INCL.NOM SIMIL NEG AV.FUT-say NEG=2SG.NOM
 sekela>> quri ‘ana kingal seka munan ka
 AV.NFIN.sufficient toward even one among 2PL.OBL NOM
 ‘Utux Baraw.

God Heaven

‘Let us fear lest the God in Heaven should say “You are not sufficient” to anyone among you.’

(Patas Suyang Kari Truku)

A precautioning clause may precede a preemptive clause, as shown in Examples (7) and (8).

- (7) Saw 'adi sepeg-un laqi ka patas nii 'u,
SIMIL NEG read-GV.FUT child NOM book this GC
sa-i liying.
go-GV.NFIN <AV>hide
'Go hide it lest a/the child should read the book.'

- (8) Saw 'adi mpeke-gerung ka peratu 'u,
SIMIL NEG AV.FUT-be_broken NOM plate GC
seku-un=na kulu.
put-GV.FUT=3SG.GEN box
'He will put the plate in a box lest it should be broken.'

In Examples (7) and (8), the precautioning clause is followed by the general conjunction 'u, a nonfinal pause, and then the preemptive clause. This order is unexpected according to the cross-linguistic preference specified by Dixon (2009: 48).

The preemptive clause may be imperative, as in Examples (5) and (7); hortative, as in Example (6); or declarative, as in Example (8).

The morphemes in the precautioning clause, that is, *saw*, 'adi, and FUTURE, are not dedicated markers for precautioning. Since most people are unfamiliar with Seediq, the following subsections explain each morpheme.

3.1 Future form

Seediq distinguishes future, non-future, perfective, non-finite, and hortative forms of verbs. The future form indicates that something is supposed to happen at a time that follows the time point of reference. The time point of reference may be the present, as shown in Example (9), or some time known from the context, as shown in Example (10).

- (9) te~tiyu-un=namu 'u!
FUT~blame-GV.FUT=2PL.NOM EXCLM
'You will be blamed!'

- (10) m-iyah ka hiya 'u, mpe-latat ka dehiya.
 AV-come NOM 3SG GC FUT-leave NOM 3PL
 'When he came, they were about to leave.'

3.2 'Adi/Negator

'Adi is a negator. It is used to negate both nominal and verbal predicates.

Example (11b) illustrates a nominal predicate.

- (11) a. Tederuy=mu ka nii.
 car=1SG.GEN NOM this
 'This is my car.'
- b. 'Adi tederuy=mu ka nii.
 NEG car=1SG.GEN NOM this
 'This is not my car.'

'Adi can be used to negate a verbal predicate, as well. The future and perfective forms of a predicate are negated by 'adi.

- (12) a. Mpe-takur ka laqi.
 AV.FUT-stumble NOM child
 'The child will stumble.'
- b. 'Adi mpe-takur ka laqi.
 NEG AV.FUT-stumble NOM child
 'The child will not stumble.'

However, for the neutral form, the corresponding negative expression is formed not with 'adi but with another negator, 'imi, plus the non-finite form.

3.3 Saw/Similitive

Saw may precede a referential expression, that is, it may be used as a similitive preposition as shown in Example (13). A prepositional phrase using saw may be used predicatively, as shown in Example (13a), and adverbially, as illustrated in Example (13b).

- (13) a. Saw bubu=na ka laqi.
 SIMIL mother=3SG.GEN NOM child
 'The child is like his/her mother.'

- b. Me-deka saw bubu=na ka laqi.
 AV-same SIMIL mother=3SG.GEN NOM child
 ‘The child is same as his/her mother.’

It may also be followed by the future form of the verb, indicating “it seems that the state of affairs denoted by the predicate will take place,” as shown in Example (14).

- (14) Saw mpe-takur ka laqi.
 SIMIL AV.FUT-stumble NOM child
 ‘It seems that the child will stumble.’

Such an affinity between the similative and epistemic possibilities is observed cross-linguistically, such as with *seem* in English, =*kán* in Pesh (Chamoreau 2017: 332), or *parecer(se)* in Spanish. Examples (15a) and (15b) are of Spanish *parecer(se)*.

- (15) a. Juan se parece mucho a su padre.
 Juan REFL look_like much to his father
 ‘Juan resembles his father very much.’

- b. Parece que va a llover.
 look_like that it_goes to rain
 ‘It seems like (it is) going to rain.’

(Creissels 2017: 79–80)

According to Creissels (2017: 80), sentences such as the one shown in Examples (15) can be considered to express similarity; the only difference is that *parecer(se)* in Example (15a) expresses the similarity between two concrete entities, whereas the same verb expresses similarity between the situation referred to and the propositional content of the embedded clause *va a llover* in Example (15b).

When the combination *saw 'adi* FUTURE is used with a referential subject, it means “it seems that the state-of-affairs denoted by the predicate will not take place,” as illustrated in Example (16).

- (16) saw 'adi mpeke-gerung ka peratu nii 'u:
 SIMIL NEG AV.FUT-be_broken NOM dish this EXCLM
 ‘This dish is not likely to break.’

However, when such a negative clause is used with an expression that

denotes a situation or an action, it expresses negative purpose (=precaution), that is, “(the situation/action) is in order that ... not ...” In Example (17), *kiya*, which is the topic expression, denotes an action.

(17) *Kiya 'u, saw 'adi se~sehengan-un ka hangan Utux*
 so GC SIMIL NEG FUT~blaspheme-GV.FUT NOM name God
 Baraw.

Heaven

‘It (=The action) is in order that the name of God in Heaven should not be blasphemed.’

(Patas Suyang Kari Truku)

Example (18) illustrates an example taken from the Bible; *kana saw nii* “all these” means “all these measures taken” here.

(18) *Kana saw nii 'u, saw 'adi se~sehengan-un*
 all SIMIL this GC SIMIL NEG FUT~blaspheme-GV.FUT
se'diq ka kari Utux Baraw.

people NOM word God Heaven

‘All these are in order that the words of God in Heaven should not be blasphemed.’

(Patas Suyang Kari Truku)

Such a usage (expressing purpose) is limited to negative clauses. The corresponding affirmative does not express purpose. Section 7 discusses this in more detail.

3.4 'u/General conjunction

As shown earlier in this section, *saw 'adi* FUTURE expresses precautioning when it is combined with an action or a situation. A clause with this predicate can be the main clause, as shown in Examples (17) and (18). It can also be used with a preemptive clause in two ways: juxtaposing it after the preemptive clause, as shown in Examples (5) and (6) and placing it before the preemptive clause with the general conjunction 'u, as illustrated in Examples (7) and (8). 'u follows the clause with *saw 'adi* FUTURE as the predicate. A non-final pause follows this 'u, following which the preemptive clause appears. Let us briefly review the use of 'u.

'*U* is a general conjunction in Seediq. One of its use is to left-dislocate some constituents from the main clause. The clause followed by '*u* may contain a conjunction or an adverb at the beginning; however, it may not have any conjunction. Without a conjunction, a clause followed by '*u* may express temporal, concessive (as shown in Example (19)), contrast, or conditional (as shown in Example (20)) but not purpose. With the aid of clause-initial conjunctions or adverbs, one can express several types of temporal relations, hypotheticals, frustrations, and so on.

(19) Concessive

Me-narux niyana 'u, wada sapah da.
 AV-sick still GC is_gone home NS
 'Though s/he was still sick, s/he (left the hospital and) went home.'

In Example (20), the function of the clause followed by '*u* is a conditional clause.

(20) Condition

M-iyah=su hini 'u, me-qaras=ku.
 AV-come=2SG.NOM here GC AV-glad=1SG.NOM
 'If you come, I would be glad.'

In Example (21), the clause followed by '*u* contains '*ana* "even" at the beginning, and functions as a frustration clause.

(21) Frustration

'*Ana* gaga quyux sayang 'u, mawsa=ku.
 even PROG <AV>rain now GC AV.FUT.go=1SG.NOM
 'Even if it is raining now, I will go.'

In Example (22), the clause followed by '*u* contains *babaw* at the beginning and expresses a relative time.

(22) Relative time ("after")

Babaw me-suwal ka quyux 'u, teduwa m-ahu lukus.
 after AV-stop NOM rain GC possible AV-wash clothes
 'After the rain stops, it is possible to wash clothes.'

4. Ambiguity

There are two types of ambiguity concerning *saw 'adi* FUTURE. Further, the ambiguity is not only regarding *saw 'adi* FUTURE phrase but also shared with all the verb phrases and *'u* clauses.

4.1 Predicate or referential expression?

In this language, a verb phrase can function as a referential expression. Since *saw 'adi* FUTURE is a verb phrase, it may function as a referential expression, as well. In Example (23), *saw 'adi qe~qepah-un* functions as a referential expression; it means “what one should not do” and functions as the patient of the verb *qe'pah* “to work.”

- (23) Ma=namu qe'pah [saw 'adi qe~qepah-un
 why=2PL.NOM <AV>work SIMIL NEG FUT~work-GV.FUT
 diyax sengay-an] hug?
 day rest-GV2 Q
 ‘Why do you do [what one should not do on Sabbath]?’
 (Patas Suyang Kari Truku, Luke 6:2)

4.2 Adverbial or nominal?

A constituent that precedes *'u* may be interpreted adverbially or nominally, depending on the context. It is the same when a clause that contains *saw 'adi* FUTURE as the predicate precedes *'u*. It can be ambiguous.

The clause preceding *'u* in Example (24) is the same as that in Example (16); however, Example (24) is interpreted to be a correlative construction (Tsukida 2014). Further, *saw 'adi mpeke-gerung ka peratu* means “It seems that the plate will not be broken” in both sentences; however, in Example (16), the clause followed by *'u* is interpreted adverbially—that is, to express purpose—and then the precautionary interpretation is highlighted. In Example (24), the clause followed by *'u* is interpreted nominally, that is, to express a correlative relationship.

- (24) Saw 'adi mpeke-gerung ka peratu 'u, berig-un=mu.
 SIMIL NEG AV.FUT-be.broken NOM plate GC buy-GV1=1SG.GEN
 'I will buy such a plate as is not likely to be broken.'
 'As for such a plate which will not be broken, I will buy one.'

The interpretation of the preceding clause adverbially or nominally depends on the semantics of both the preceding and following clauses.

5. Argument configuration: Consideration of different or same subjects

In Seediq, the subjects of the precautionary and preemptive clauses may be the same or different. In Examples (5) and (6), the precautionary and preemptive clauses have different subjects. In Example (5), the subject of the preemptive clause is *kari=su* "your words." The subject of the precautionary clause is not expressed; however, the subject is probably the hearer. In Example (6), the subject of the preemptive clause is *=ta* "1PL.IN." The subject of the precautionary clause is *'Utux Baraw* "God in Heaven." A different subject is allowed in Example (25), as well. Example (25) is an example of a precautionary clause connected by *'u*.

- (25) Saw 'adi mawsa baraw ka laqi 'u,
 SIMIL NEG AV.FUT.go higher_place NOM child GC
 heci-an=na m-erehug ka rehengun.
 put-GV2=3SG.GEN AV-lock NOM door
 'S/He locked the door lest the child should go upstairs.'
 S_{precautioning}: ka laqi "the child"
 S_{preemptive}: ka rehengun "the door"

In the precautionary and preemptive clauses shown in Examples (7) and (8), the subject is the same and is omitted in the preemptive clause. In Example (7), the subject of the precautionary clause is *ka patas* "the book" and the subject of the preemptive clause is also supposed to be *ka patas*, though it is omitted, because the predicate *sa-i liying* is GV, which requires the patient as the subject. In Example (8), the subjects are the same in both the precautioning and preemptive clauses. In Example (8), the patient

of the verb “put,” that is, *peratu* “dish” is the subject as the predicate in the preemptive clause is the GV form *seku-un*.

There are some cases in which it is not permitted to change the voice of the preemptive clause or make a different argument for the subject, as in Example (8). If we transform the agent of the preemptive clause of Example (8) into the subject, which is the non-subject in Example (8), such a sentence, that is, Example (26), is not allowed.

- (26) *Saw 'adi mpeke-gerung ka peratu 'u, seku=ku
 SIMIL NEG AV.FUT-be_broken NOM plate GC <AV>put=1SG.NOM
 kulu.
 box
 S_{precautioning}: ka peratu, S_{preemptive}: =ku

6. Semantics

As for Seediq *saw 'adi* FUTURE, in-case interpretation is unnatural, as in Example (27).

- (27) ???Saw adi mpe-kuyux 'u, 'angal bubung.
 SIMIL NEG AV.FUT-rain GC AV.NFIN.take umbrella
 ‘Take an umbrella lest it rains.’

7. Affirmative purpose clauses

Affirmative version of “*saw 'adi* FUTURE ...” is “*saw* FUTURE ...”. This expression does not express affirmative purpose but describes a situation in which something is likely to happen, as shown in 3.3. This expression does not have an undesirability nuance. It may express both desirable and undesirable situations. If one is a farmer and waiting for rain, one would utter Example (28b).

- (28) a. Saw mpe-kuyux 'u, 'angal bubung.
 SIMIL AV.FUT-rain GC AV.NFIN.take umbrella
 ‘As it is likely to rain, take an umbrella.’

- b. Saw mpe-kuyux 'u, me-qaras=ku.
SIMIL AV.FUT-rain GC AV-glad=1SG.NOM
'As it is likely to rain, I am glad.'

In Examples (28a) and (28b), the 'u clause expresses an already established situation. In a precautioning usage, 'u clauses express irrealis situations. The irrealis meaning may be due to the negator 'adi.

Saw FUTURE (affirmative) may occur in an apprehensional situation as in Example (29) and with verbs of fearing, as in Example (30); however, it is not a dedicated marker for these aspects, as seen in Examples (28a) and (28b).

- (29) Saw mpe-tuting ka peratu!
SIMIL AV.FUT-fall NOM dish
'The dish is likely to fall!'

- (30) Saw mpe-tuting ka peratu 'u, me-isug=ku.
SIMIL AV.FUT-fall NOM dish GC, AV-afraid=1SG.NOM
'As the dish is likely to fall, I fear.'

In Seediq, the affirmative purpose is expressed using CV future phrase (Tsukida 2006). The agent occurs as a genitive phrase. CV future phrase can be juxtaposed after the main clause, as in Example (31) or be placed before the main clause with general conjunction 'u, as in Example (32). It can occur as predicate, as in Example (33) or as a subject, as in Example (34), as well. In the following examples, the CV future phrase is shown within square brackets.

- (31) durung=ku [qe~qebelaiq=na].
<AV>pray=1SG.NOM FUT-CV.FUT.happy=3SG.GEN
'I pray for him to be happy.'
- (32) [de~danga=na piyi-an] 'u, m-usa
FUT-CV.FUT.feed=3SG.GEN old_woman-OBL GC AV-go
sapah=na kedediyax.
house=3SG.GEN every_day
'In order to feed a/the old woman, s/he goes to her house every day.'
- (33) [pe~patas=na] ka se-hegeliq=na lebelak nii.
FUT-CV.FUT.write=3SG.GEN NOM CV-tear=3SG.GEN paper this
'The reason s/he tore paper is for her/him to write.'

- (34) hegeleq-ani lebelak nii ka [pe~patas=su].
 tear-CV.NFIN paper this NOM FUT~CV.FUT.write=2SG.GEN
 ‘Tear this paper for you to write.’

Negated CV future form expressing negative purpose is found in predicate position in Example (35).

- (35) kiya ‘u, [‘adi=deha te~tegesa kari kiristo].
 so GC NEG=3PL.GEN FUT~CV.FUT.teach story Christ
 ‘It was for them not to propagate Christianity.’

One can use Example (36) with almost the same meaning as Example (35). The difference between negative CV future form and *saw* ‘*adi* FUTURE is yet to be clarified.

- (36) kiya ‘u, saw ‘adi mpe-tegesa kari kiristo ka dehiya.
 so GC SIMIL NEG AV.FUT-teach story Christ NOM 3PL
 ‘It was for them not to propagate Christianity.’

8. Purpose clauses in Atayal

Atayal, which is a language very close to Seediq both genetically and geographically, does not use the similative to express purpose. In Atayal, *quzi*’ is used as a similative, as in Example (37), whereas *teta*’ is used for both affirmative and negative purposes, as in Examples (38) and (39).

- (37) Atayal: Similative
 ini’ balay quzi’ yaya’ nya’ ka mthhuy i
 NEG really SIMIL mother 3SG.GEN LINKER gentle NOM
 Sonun qani.
 Sonun this
 ‘This Sonun is not really as gentle as her mother.’
 (<https://e-dictionary.ilrdf.org.tw/tay/terms/262042.htm>)

- (38) Atayal: Negative purpose clause
 Pskut mhul tetā’ ini’ shlus
 tight AV.hold PURPOSE NEG slip
 ‘Hold tight so that you will not slip!’
 (<https://e-dictionary.ilrdf.org.tw/tay/terms/261747.htm>)

(39) Atayal: Affirmative purpose clause

Bkuw cikay isu' qu tqinu qani ha.
arrange a_bit 2SG OBL mushroom this GENTLE
teta' helaw m-kzyay.
purpose quickly AV-dry

'Arrange these mushrooms a bit so that they will dry quickly.'

(<https://e-dictionary.ilrdf.org.tw/tay/terms/260765.htm>)

9. Summary

This study examined Seediq precautioning clauses, from a typological perspective. In Seediq, precautioning clauses are expressed by *saw* (SIMIL) *'adi* (NEG) FUTURE. A precautioning clause may follow or precede a preemptive clause. When it precedes, the two clauses are connected by *'u*. These words are not dedicated to precautioning clauses but have other usages as well. Other usages were explained in Section 3. The subject of the precautioning and main clauses may be the same or different (see Section 5). This construction cannot express an IN-CASE meaning (see Section 6). Its affirmative counterpart, *saw* FUTURE, is not used to express purpose. Instead, the CV future form is used (see Section 7). Regarding the historical development of Seediq precautioning clauses, we could not examine them in detail in this study, since not much data on older Seediq clauses are available. Neighboring language Atayal does not use similitive to express purpose (see Section 8).

Several other languages worldwide use similitive to express purpose. Ethiopian languages and Japanese are some examples. Among such languages, some (e.g., Ethiopian languages) limit their use to negative purpose (precautioning) only, similar to Seediq. There seems to be a common motivation for such limitations among languages. This issue will be addressed by Tsukida (forthcoming).

Notes

- 1 A part of this paper was presented at the Syntax of the World's languages 8 held at INALCO, Paris, France, on September 3–5, 2018.
- 2 I would like to thank Editage (www.editage.com) for English language editing.
- 3 Seediq phonemes are /p, t, k, q, ' , b, d, s, x, h, g, c, l, r, m, n, ng, y, w, i, u, a, e/. Here, c is for [ts], l is for [ɫ], r is for [r], g is for [ɣ], and e is for [ɛ] or [ɐ] or [ə]. c and s are palatalized before /i/.
- 4 Abbreviations used in glosses are as follows: 1: first person, 2: second person, 3: third person, AV: Agent Voice, CAUS: Causative, CNJ: General Conjunctive, CV: Conveyance Voice, EXCLM: Exclamation, FUT: Future, GC: General Conjunctive, GEN: Genitive, GENTLE: Gentle, GV: Goal Voice, GV1: Goal Voice 1, GV2: Goal Voice 2, HORT: Hortative, INCL: Inclusive, INTR: Intransitive, NEG: Negative, NOM: Nominative, NFIN: Non-Finite, NMLZ: Nominalizer, NS: New Situation, OBL: Oblique, PL: Plural, PRF: Perfective, PROG: Progressive, PROH: Prohibitive, PST: Past, SG: Singular, SIML: Similitive, and UNCERTAIN: Uncertain.

References

- Chamoreau, Claudine. 2017. Multifunctionality and polysemy of the similitive marker =kán in Pesh. In Yvonne Treis and Martine Vanhove (eds.), *Similitive and equative constructions: A cross-linguistic perspective*, 321–337. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Creissels, Denis. 2017. Similarity, suitability, and non-epistemic modalities (volitionality, ability and obligation). In Yvonne Treis and Martine Vanhove (eds.), *Similitive and equative constructions: A cross-linguistic perspective*, 79–90. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dench, Alan. 1988. Complex sentences in Martuthunira. In Peter Austin (ed.), *Complex sentence constructions in Australian languages*, 97–139. Typological Studies in Language. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 2009. The semantics of clause linking in a typological perspective. In Robert M. W. Dixon and Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *The semantics of clause linking: A cross-linguistic typology* (1st edn.), 1–55. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 2005. The Austroneasian languages of Asia and Madagascar: Typological characteristics. In Alexander Adelaar and Nikolaus P. Himmelmann (eds.), *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 110–181. London: Routledge.
- Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 1995. Apprehensional epistemics. In Joan Bybee and Suzanne Fleischman (eds.), *Modality in grammar and discourse*, 293–327. Amsterdam: John

- Benjamins.
- Schmidtke-Bode, Karsten. 2009. A Typology of Purpose Clauses. *Typological studies in Language* 88. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tsukida, Naomi. 2005. Seediq. In Nikolaus Himmelmann and Sander Adelaar (eds.) *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 291–325. London: Routledge.
- Tsukida, Naomi. 2006. The adverbial function of Seediq conveyance voice future form. In Chang, Yung-li, Lillian M. Huang and Dah-an Ho (eds.) *Streams converging into an Ocean: Festschrift in Honor of Prof. Paul Jen-kuei Li on His 70th Birthday*, 185–204. Language and Linguistics Monograph Series W-5. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Tsukida, Naomi. 2014. Correlative clauses in Seediq. In I. Wayan Arka and N. L. K. Mas Indrawati (eds.), *Argument realizations and related constructions in Austronesian languages: Papers from 12-ICAL. Volume 2*, 69–79. Canberra: Asia-Pacific Linguistics.
- Tsukida, Naomi. (Forthcoming). *You-ni* purpose clauses in Japanese and their evolution. *Bulletin of the Graduate School of International Cultural Studies, Aichi Prefectural University*. No. 25.
- Vuilletmet, Marine and Eva Schulze-Berndt. September 3–5, 2018. *Workshop 4: Lest we miss them*. Syntax of the World's Languages 8, Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales, Paris. <https://swl8.sciencesconf.org/resource/page/id/6.html>

Texts

- Online Dictionary of Taiwan Aboriginal languages: Indigenous Language Research Development Foundation. 2021. <https://e-dictionary.ilrdf.org.tw/index.htm>
- Patas Suyang Kari Truku (Seediq): The Bible Society in Taiwan. 2005.

セデック語の警戒節

月 田 尚 美

要旨

台湾原住民諸語のセデック語の警戒節 (precautioning clause、「～しないように」) について検討した。セデック語では、「*saw* + '*adi* + FUTURE」という形式で表される。警戒節と先制節 (preemptive clause、警戒節が表す事態を防ぐためにどういう措置を取る / 取ったのかを表す節) は、どちらが先行することも可能で、警戒節が先に出る場合には '*u* が間に現れる。それぞれの語は、警戒節専用の表現ではなく、*saw* は類似格の前置詞、'*adi* は否定辞、FUTURE は未来形、'*u* は一般接続詞である。それぞれの語の用法を述べた。その後、この表現の曖昧性、意味について論じた。警戒節と先制節の主語は同じであることも別であることもある。In-case の意味を表すことはない。「*saw* + '*adi* + FUTURE」に対応する肯定形「*saw* + FUTURE」は、'*u* を挟んで他の節と繋げても、これからそういうことが起こりそうなので、という状況を表すだけで、目的を表すことはない。「～するために」を表すには、CV 未来形を用いる (Tsukida 2006 を参照)。セデック語に近いアタヤル語には、警戒節に類似格を用いることがないことも示した。歴史的な発達については、調べることができなかった。